



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/752,049 | 12/28/2000 | Xia Dai | 042390.P10232 | 8997 |

7590

01/21/2003

John P. Ward
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

CHANG, YEAN HSI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2835

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/752,049

Applicant(s)

DAI, XIA

Examiner

Yean-Hsi Chang

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "micro-drive" in claims 6 and 25, "system-on-chip (SOC)" in claim 7, and "wireless keyboard" in claim 10 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claims 2 and 22 recite the limitation "wherein the electronic display screen includes a processor that operates when the electronic display screen is docked to the base and does not operate when the electronic display screen is detached from the base" in lines 1-4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the specification. Similarly, claim 19 recites the limitation "wherein the first

Art Unit: 2835

information processing device includes a processor that operates when the first information processing device is docked to the second information processing device and does not operate when the first information processing device is detached from the second information processing device " in lines 1-5.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 4-6, 9, 11, 15 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities: The "the's" in "the notebook computer base" in claim 4, "the base components" in claim 5, "the electronic display screen components" in claims 6 and 25, "the back" in claim 9, and the "a" in "a base" in claim 11. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is non-descriptive and incomplete since no structural information is given.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-8, 11, 21-22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anti by Kochis et al. (US 5,825,617).

Kochis teaches an electronic display screen comprising:

- The electronic display screen (312, fig. 13) functions as an electronic display screen when docked to a base (328, fig. 13) and functions as an information processing device (11, fig. 2) when detached from the base (see 301, fig. 18) (claims 1 and 21)
- Wherein the electronic display screen includes a processor (344, fig. 18) (claims 2 and 22)
- Wherein the information processing device is a palm computer (see col. 6, lines 2-4) (claims 3 and 24)
- Wherein the base includes a notebook computer base (328, fig. 13) (claim 4)
- Wherein the base includes a memory (380, fig. 18) and a keyboard (360, fig. 18) (claim 5)

Art Unit: 2835

- Wherein the electronic display screen includes a processor (344, fig. 18), a voltage regulator (355, fig. 18), and a system-on-chip (SOC) (it is inherent that a processor has a SOC to start with) (claims 6,7 and 25)
 - A battery (36, fig. 1) being mounted on an edge of the display screen (claim 8)
 - Wherein the electronic display screen can receive a point and press input and a scribble input (see col. 9, lines 9-10) (claim 15)
8. Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anti by Kochis et al. Kochis teaches a system comprising:
- A first information processing device (312, fig. 13) (claim 16)
 - A second information processing device (328, fig. 13) (claim 16)
 - Wherein the first information processing device functions as an electronic display screen when docked to the second information processing device and functions as an information processing device (11, fig. 2) when detached from the second information processing device (see 301, fig. 18) (claim 16)
 - Wherein the electronic display screen includes a processor (344, fig. 18) (claims 17 and 19)
 - Wherein the second information processing device includes a notebook computer base (328, fig. 13) (claim 18)
 - Wherein the information processing device is a palm computer (see col. 6, lines 2-4) (claim 20)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochis et al. in view of Newman et al. (US 6,359,777 B1).

Kochis discloses the claimed invention except a battery being mounted on the back of the display screen. However, Newman teaches a mobile computer having a battery (12, fig. 2) mounted on back of a display screen (7, fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Kochis with the battery taught by Newman for the purpose of front area savings.

11. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochis et al. in view of Register (US 5,440,502).

Kochis discloses the claimed invention except that the electronic display screen receives input from a wireless keyboard. However, Register teaches a portable computer (100, fig. 1) receives input from a keyboard (120, fig. 1) via a wireless link (see col. 5, lines 42-45). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2835

art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Kochis with the wireless keyboard taught by Register so that keyboard input could be sent through a wireless link.

12. Claims 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochis et al. in view of Lemke et al. (US 5,850,209).

Kochis discloses the claimed invention except that the electronic display screen can access base resources through a wireless link when the electronic display screen is detached from the base. However, Lemke teaches a portable computer (10', fig. 5) having a wireless electronic display screen (38', fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Kochis with the electronic display screen taught by Lemke so that the electronic display screen can access the resources of the base through a wireless link.

13. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochis et al. in view of Lee (US 6,065,124).

Kochis discloses the claimed invention except that the electronic display screen including a Suspend-to-RAM (STR) feature. However, Lee teaches a Suspend-to-Ram feature (STR) (fig. 2; see col. 4, lines 21-31). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the power control device of Kochis with the STR feature taught by Lee so that the electronic display screen could enter into a low power state for saving power.

Correspondence

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yean-Hsi Chang whose telephone number is (703) 306-5798. The examiner can normally be reached on 07:30-16:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on (703) 308-4815. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3431 for regular communications and for After Final communications. There are RightFAX numbers and provide the fax sender with an auto-reply fax verifying receipt by the USPTO: Before-Final (703-872-9318) and After-Final (703-872-9319).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-8558.

Application/Control Number: 09/752,049

Page 9

Art Unit: 2835

Yean-Hsi Chang

Patent Examiner

Art Unit: 2835

January 13, 2003


DARREN SCHUBERG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 6

JOHN P. WARD
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1026

COPY MAILED

OCT 22 2001

In re Application of
Dai

Application No. 09/752,049

Filed: December 28, 2000

Attorney Docket No.: 042390.P1023

For: DUAL FUNCTION ELECTRONIC
DISPLAY SCREEN

ON PETITION

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

The above-identified application has been forwarded to this office for consideration of the request for corrected filing receipt filed July 23, 2001. This request is being treated under 37 CFR 1.10(d) as a petition to accord the above-identified application a filing date of December 28, 2000 instead of December 29, 2000.

Petitioner alleges that the application was deposited in Express Mail service on December 28, 2000. Petitioner has provided evidence to this effect, including a copy of an "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" mailing label bearing tracking number EL672749673US (the same Express Mail number found on the transmittal letter accompanying the original application papers located in the official file). The "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" label bears a "date-in" of December 28, 2000.

In view of the above, the petition under 37 CFR 1.10(d) is **GRANTED**.

This application is being forwarded to the Official of Initial Patent Examination for correction of the filing date to December 28, 2000.

Telephone inquiries related to this decision may be directed to Petitions Attorney Alesia M. Brown at (703) 305-0310.

Beverly M. Flanagan
Beverly M. Flanagan
Supervisory Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy